Applicant : Marmaros et al.                Attorney's Docket No.: 16113-1317001 / GP-178-00-US
Serial No. : 10/750,183
Filed     : December 31, 2003
Page     : 10 of 13

# REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 35, 37-42, 59 and 60 were pending as of the final office action mailed on February 5, 2009 ("Final Action"). Claims 4-9, 11, 35, 37-42, 59 and 60 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and new claims 61 to 93 have been added. Support for the features recited by the new claims exists throughout the disclosure, including at least ¶¶ [0033], [0037], and [0045] of the published application. Reexamination of the application and reconsideration of the Final Action are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

## I.     Interview Summary

The undersigned thanks Examiner Truong for the courtesies extended during the personal interview conducted on March 25, 2009. In the interview, the amendments to claim 1 were discussed, with Examiner Truong agreeing that, when entered, they would overcome the applied rejections. Examiner Truong also indicated that further search and/or consideration would be required.

## II.     Claim Objections

The objections to claims 1 and 35 are set forth in page 4 of the Final Action. The term "respective query-relevant snippet" in claim 1 is amended to remove the "respective" term. As noted above, claim 35 has been cancelled, without conceding the correctness of the objection.

The term "the corresponding search result" in claim 1 is not amended as suggested by the Examiner, i.e., it is not amended to read "the corresponding search result document." The claim is intended to read that the corresponding search result is displayed for selection, and not the corresponding search result document. Note that the specification distinguishes between a search result and a search result document; see, for example, paragraphs 9 and 31 and Figs. 1-5 of the originally filed specification, and claim 1 recites both a search result and a search result document.

## III.    Claim 1 Is Not Obvious Over Schneider And Cupps

Claims 1, 35, 59 and 60 were rejected as being allegedly obvious over Schneider (U.S.

Pat. No. 6,895,430) in view of Cupps (U.S. Pat. No. 5,991,739). As noted above, claims 4-9, 11,

35, 37-42, 59 and 60 have been cancelled, without conceding the correctness of the rejection.

The rejections are traversed on the grounds that the combination of Schneider and Cupps

does not disclose, teach, or suggest the newly added feature of "a corresponding active snippet

link to a portion of the corresponding search result document, the active snippet link containing a

query-relevant snippet" and "navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result

document when the corresponding active snippet link is selected" as claimed.

With respect to claim 1, the Applicants thank Examiner Truong for acknowledging that

the new features added to the claims, including the feature of "a corresponding active snippet

link to a portion of the corresponding search result document containing a query-relevant

snippet," overcome the prior art of record. *See* Interview Summary dated March 25, 2009.

As explained during the interview, Schneider and Cupps does not disclose, teach, or

suggest these features. At most Schneider and Cupps disclose only a search result link that links

to a top of a corresponding search result document; there is no disclosure of the active snippet

link.

In the Office Action, the Examiner correctly states that Schneider does not teach the

claimed limitations of

> generating in the search engine an instruction for each of search results
> that is configured to cause the client device to....navigate directly to a portion of
> the query-relevant snippet within the corresponding search result document when
> the query-relevant snippet is selected by a user from a display of the search result
> on the client device.

Final Action, pg. 6. The Examiner relies on the exemplary menu web pages 144 of Cupps to fill

this void. The bases of the Examiner's rejections are provided on pages 6-8 of the Final Action.

The description regarding the menu web pages 144 in Figs. 8-10 of Cupps, however, does

not disclose the claimed instruction for each search result nor the claimed navigating directly to

the portion of the corresponding search result document when the corresponding active snippet

link is selected. Cupps teaches that each of the menu web pages 144 is created in response to a

customer request:

> The online ordering machine 106 generates menu web pages 144 that are
> specific to a particular customer's request. The creation of the menu web pages
> 144 is done dynamically at runtime in order to provide data that accommodates a
> customer's request. The creation of the menu web pages 144 in this manner
> differs from the prior art online order systems. In the prior art online order
> systems, the menu web pages are preconfigured and displayed upon request. This
> becomes a burden to maintain and limits scalability. In the present technology,
> each menu web page 144 is configured at runtime and customized for a particular
> customer's request. Thus, each menu web page 144 differs since each customer's
> request is different as is the customer's location.

See Cupps, col. 8, ll. 43-55. Thus, Cupps cannot disclose the claimed instruction that is

configured to cause the client device to "navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding

search result document when the corresponding active snippet link is selected" because Cupps

discloses a system in which <u>no corresponding search result document exists from which the</u>

<u>query-relevant snippet was extracted</u>. Accordingly, there is no navigating "directly to the portion

of the corresponding search result document when the corresponding active snippet link is

selected" as the claimed "search result document" does not exist in Cupps.

Furthermore, assuming *arguendo* that Cupps does teach navigating to a search result

document from which the query-relevant snippet was extracted, Cupps nevertheless does not

teach an instruction that causes the client device to navigate directly to a portion of the query-

relevant snippet within the corresponding search result document. Indeed, with respect to

navigation, Cupps teaches no more than Schneider – i.e., a document (a web page from a URL in

Schneider or a dynamically generated menu web page in Cupps) is provided to a client device

and rendered at the client device. There is no discussion of "navigating directly to the portion of

the corresponding search result document when the corresponding active snippet link is selected"

as claimed in claim 1.

Claims 71 and 82 have similar features. Accordingly, the arguments presented for claim

1 below apply equally to claims 71 and 82.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claims 1, 71 and 82, and all claims depending

therefrom, should be withdrawn.

## IV.    Conclusion

The allowability of all of the pending claims has been addressed. The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/1/9

Paul E. Franz
Reg. No. 45,910

**Customer No. 26192**
Telephone: (404) 892-5005
Facsimile: (404) 892-5002

40555085.doc